DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 968 EA 010 466

TITLE Evaluating Our Performance: An Advisory for Boards of Trustees and School Heads.
INSTITUTION National Association of Independent Schools, Boston, Mass.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 73p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Association of Independent Schools, 4 Liberty Square, Boston, Massachusetts 02109 ($4.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; *Board Administrator Relationship; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation; Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Needs; *Governing Boards; *Principals; *Private Schools; Program Descriptions; School Improvement; Self Evaluation; Trustees

ABSTRACT

Boards of trustees and heads of private elementary and secondary schools need to engage in some form of annual evaluation as a means of achieving greater stability in the relations between head administrators and governing boards, according to the authors. This paper briefly explores the philosophical ramifications of evaluation and outlines practical suggestions for carrying out an evaluation process, including self-evaluation by board and head administrator, evaluation of the head administrator by the board, and timing considerations. Descriptions of nine evaluation processes in effect in various private schools are appended. (Author)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED151968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# EVALUATING OUR PERFORMANCE

An Advisory for
Boards of Trustees and School Heads

NAIS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NAIS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS
4 Liberty Square, Boston, Massachusetts 02109

EA 010 466

Copyright © 1978 by the National Association of Independent Schools

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer, who may quote brief passages in a review to be printed in a magazine or newspaper.

Printed in U.S.A.

Additional copies of this publication may be ordered, at $4.00 each, from:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS
4 Liberty Square, Boston, Massachusetts 02109

## Contents

Preface v

EVALUATING OUR PERFORMANCE 1

Philosophy of evaluation - Evaluation procedures - The first step: board self-evaluation - A concurrent step: head self-evaluation - Evaluation of the head by the trustees - Timetable for evaluation - Some concluding thoughts on evaluation

APPENDIXES 13

Appendix A, 15 - Appendix B, 26 - Appendix C, 35 - Appendix D, 43 - Appendix E, 44 - Appendix F, 49 - Appendix G, 50 - Appendix H, 54 - Appendix I, 55 - Appendix J, 56

## Preface

Independent schools today live with the tension that comes from the need to change with the times while maintaining stability and continuity. The responsibility for achieving a balance between these forces rests primarily with boards of trustees and heads, whose ability to establish mutual goals and to work creatively together began to be severely tested in the 1960's.

The board-head relationship is unique in requiring forthrightness and restraint as well as an understanding of the responsibilities and prerogatives of each. Winston Churchill once observed that school heads have powers at their disposal with which prime ministers have never yet been invested. No longer are such absolute powers possible or desirable; and though independent school trustees are assuming more responsibility and making greater commitments than ever before, they too must exercise their authority within certain limits.

It was with these concerns in mind that members of the NAIS School Administration Committee and the newly formed Trustee Committee came together for the first time in 1976. Our goal was to seek out ways to help boards and heads function in closer harmony at a time when new pressures and dilemmas had greatly increased the complexity of independent school governance.

For two years, the committees met jointly to discuss a wide range of school matters, always in the context of board-head cooperation. As a group of trustees and heads, we not only found a great deal of common

ground but also enjoyed the luxury of agreeing and disagreeing on some issues. Together we planned sessions for the 1977 and 1978 annual conferences dealing with several aspects of school governance.

One central theme pervaded our work and discussions from the very beginning: the need for trustees and heads to engage in some form of annual evaluation, whether formal or informal. In the search for stability, and despite the sensitivities involved, evaluation of the performance of both the board and the head is essential to good communications and effective goal setting.

Our committees therefore worked together to produce this statement, which is intended to be descriptive rather than prescriptive and which includes samples of various approaches to evaluation. Major credit for its preparation belongs to Donald V. Buttenheim, of the Trustee Committee, who received important assistance from Christopher Berrisford, of the School Administration Committee.

In offering this statement, we emphasize that each school should explore evaluation from its own vantage point, considering carefully its particular situation before embarking on any one type of evaluation.

We hope that this publication may help suggest ways for trustees and heads to work in closer harmony and with greater productivity for the benefit of their schools.

Trustee Committee, 1977-78

Georgia E. Welles, Chairman
Maumee Valley Country Day School, Toledo, Ohio

Donald V. Buttenheim
Emma Willard School, Troy, N.Y.

School Administration Committee, 1977-78

Malcolm Coates, Chairman
Lake Forest Country Day School, Lake Forest, Ill.

Christopher Berrisford
Harvard School, North Hollywood, Calif.

Trustee Committee, 1977-78

Amey DeFriez
The Ethel Walker School,
Simsbury, Conn.

John S. Hollister
George School, Newtown, Pa.

Edward W. Kelley, Jr.
St. John's School,
Houston, Tex.

Harry C. McCray, Jr.
Pembroke-Country Day
School, Kansas City, Mo.

William Wade Wood
Charlotte Country Day
School, Charlotte, N.C.

School Administration Committee, 1977-78

George G. Kirkpatrick
Pace Academy, Atlanta, Ga.

Frances R. O'Connor
Emma Willard School, Troy, N.Y.

Thomas Read
St. John's School, Houston, Tex.

David F. Sheldon
Middlesex School, Concord, Mass.

Mary Frances Wagley
Saint Paul's School for Girls,
Brooklandville, Md.

## EVALUATING OUR PERFORMANCE

At a fall 1977 meeting of the Trustee Committee of NAIS, someone commented that whenever trustees from different schools come together these days evaluation is almost certain to be a topic of discussion, if not as a part of the formal agenda, surely as one of the first subjects raised in informal discussion. Relatively few boards, however, have instituted any form of board self-evaluation, the essential starting point before setting up criteria and procedures for evaluating the head. What has been holding them back?

One obvious answer is that evaluation is not easy to initiate and carry out, even though a fair number of trustees on any given board usually are business executives and thus accustomed to evaluation in their own firms. Board members tend to think of evaluation as quite a different matter when dealing with education and personal growth instead of with a tangible product or a specific service (even though such a distinction is less warranted when dealing with either the policy-making or administrative aspects of education). Schools are more than a business, but a business they certainly are. And they have to be run, and run effectively and efficiently, even though their end product, departing students, can never be fully evaluated.

Whatever the cause of trustee reluctance to deal with evaluation, the fact remains that it has been more common for heads to lead boards into the process than the other way around. And, as a corollary, schools having the least need of formal evaluation often have the most experience with it.

Because, while every head, new or old, secure or insecure, wants to know how the board likes what he or she is doing, it is the self-assured head, already having good rapport with the board, who is not only ready but anxious for the heightened communication that comes with formal evaluation.

The average trustee, especially if relatively new on the scene, is nervous about evaluation lest it involve him or her heavily in judging personal qualities and relationships. This need not be, for evaluation, correctly understood, consists of realistic assessment of performance toward mutually agreed-upon objectives.

No trustee should accept a position on a board without being aware of the obligations that he or she is assuming or without a clear understanding that the contribution of each board member is subject to review. A school head knows from the start that there is a job to be done, that success is not easy, and that there are many people constantly making informal personal judgments, usually without full information, on what he or she is doing. A conscientious head should therefore insist on formal evaluation to prevent negative informal assessment in any segment of the community from undermining the real achievements of his or her administration.

The purpose of this book is to review the philosophy and rationale behind institutional leadership assessment, then to indicate general procedures, and finally to outline several different kinds of evaluation used in NAIS schools.

## Philosophy of Evaluation

A thoroughly constructive approach to evaluation views the process not as a means of appraising the weaknesses of individuals but as a nonthreatening group effort that can strengthen the school as a whole. The board takes a

positive stand by saying, in effect, "We're doing well (or at least fairly well), but how can we do better?" Such an approach can lead to free and open interchange among all those involved as they seek to identify and accentuate strengths and to encourage improvements where needed. The long-term purposes of evaluation are to seek new avenues to excellence and to achieve the previously identified mission of the school. Its short-term objective is to help the board and the head improve policy making and administration in the school and thus to improve overall institutional management. Such an approach will remind the board that it chose the head (presumably after careful search) and thus that it is responsible for doing everything possible to assure his or her success.

While every school has to work out its own approach, there are common elements that work simultaneously to further the self-understanding and effectiveness of trustees and to improve the performance of the head. As the head of one NAIS member school said, quite simply, "No organization can function effectively if people don't know where they stand." He went on to say that what he called the "caught by surprise element" is behind many recent premature terminations of headship. Evaluation as a regular, formal process can minimize the likelihood that either board or head will be suddenly surprised or antagonized by the action or reaction of the other on some major issue. They will have been communicating openly and frequently all along; hence all issues will be out in the open before they reach cosmic significance or before disagreement about any one issue starts to threaten any of the people who are trying to find solutions.

Evaluation should be regarded as a part of the search for stability--and a means of getting away from the kind of environment that can put the future of the head (and thus the school) in total jeopardy on any specific

issue or issues--which can (and usually do) surface very quickly. Unfortunately, one wrong decision by a head on a sensitive matter can often outweigh half a dozen positive, correct responses to more routine or less controversial matters. Ultimately, however, it is overall performance that counts. Good evaluation does not dwell on the effects of one incident; rather it is concerned with achievement over a period of time.

If the board and the head can set objectives for the coming year, or for several years, and then evaluate their collective progress toward the ends they have agreed on, it is likely that this shared responsibility will lead to fair assessment of individual performance. This is by far the best method for assuring progress and evaluating trustees and head while avoiding unjustified, invidious, or threatening judgments.

## Evaluation Procedures

Several of the evaluation statements included in the Appendixes give specific job definitions and suggest effective procedures. Each school should, however, develop procedures that are best suited to its needs.

We believe that evaluation should include assessment of board and head either together or consecutively. In developing an evaluation method, different heads and boards will want to move at different speeds, paying particular attention to the existing state of board/head relations. Successful evaluation requires close and productive relations between the head and the board chairman. If such rapport does not exist, it can be developed by frank and open discussion of the need for evaluation, which will in turn establish communication and a realistic understanding of the responsibilities of each position.

Two other major elements to be considered are the school's position in

its own life cycle (brand new or well established; in the red or in strong financial shape; on a rising or declining enrollment curve) and the status of the head (new in the position or a veteran). It should be recognized that the head's relations with the board will vary markedly at different stages of the head's tenure. In the first year or two, the board watches the head's performance closely and provides considerable direction and guidance. As the board becomes assured of the head's competence, it gradually loosens the reins. In three to five years or so, close working relations, characterized by mutual trust and sharing of responsibility, are established. At this stage, it is natural for the head to assume greater leadership and for the board to look more to the head for direction. In due course, a strong head usually becomes the leader of both board and school.

Thus the nature and form of evaluation should change as the board/head relationship changes. The new head expects direction and close observation; the established head, most likely to be his or her own most critical evaluator, may even have to insist that the board play a part in the process.

Keeping these points in mind, each school needs to develop its own approach and to discover by trial, and undoubtedly some error, over a period of time (one to three years), what seems to work best for it. In order to succeed, whatever system is developed should come from the cooperative effort and joint resolution of the board and head.

Certain preliminaries can do much to keep evaluation positive as it moves along. Barry Munitz, probably the most prolific speaker and writer on evaluation of educational leadership, has identified some preliminaries

that are as applicable to schools as they are to colleges and universities.*

1. It helps if the board defines its task as a "continuous assessment of overall school quality" within which the review of management personnel performance is seen as one integral element.

2. The board must be sure that it has not set forth expectations for the head's performance, either at the time of hiring or in some previous review, that are unrealistic in relation to the head's delegation of authority.

3. A distinction must be drawn between the management performance and the personal style of the head in carrying out that performance. Changing one's "style" or one's own personal qualities is much harder than changing ways of doing things. Not only are some heads more malleable than others, but personal abrasiveness can be a factor on either side of the board/head relationship.

4. Every head should recognize his or her responsibility for educating trustees, including open discussion with them of what they can do to help improve the performance of the administrative team.

The First Step: Board Self-Evaluation

Once the board has recognized the need for continuous, systematic assessment of school quality, it is almost sure to find that some kind of formal self-evaluation is called for. If the board includes enough of the right questions on its self-evaluation form or checklist, the trustees not only gain a clearer perception of their role and their legal responsibilities but they find themselves having to reach or review conclusions on the school's mission and on how and why that mission justifies the continued existence of the school.

---

*From "Presidential Evaluation: An Assessment of Educational Leadership," March 1976, an essay prepared under the auspices of the Fund for Improvement of Post-Secondary Education. Barry Munitz was formerly academic vice president of the University of Illinois system and is now vice president and dean of faculties at the University of Houston.

It is obvious that the leadership of the board chairman or president is essential to instituting worthwhile board self-evaluation. If the board has an executive committee, the idea can first be explored with the committee, and its suggestions can be solicited in developing the form and questions to be answered by the rest of the board. In other cases, the nominating committee can serve as the group that gets evaluation under way, especially in a school that has made (or wants to make) its nominating committee a full-fledged trusteeship committee.

The Appendixes contain board self-evaluation forms used by several schools. Much can also be gleaned from the Self-Study Criteria for Governing Boards of Private Colleges and Universities, which the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges has kindly allowed us to reproduce in Appendix J.

While the effect of self-examination on the outlook of individual trustees is undoubtedly the most important result of evaluation, whatever form or checklist is used should be most carefully reviewed by the board chairman and the head of the school and their pertinent conclusions and observations be brought before the full board for discussion and possible group endorsement. At any such meeting, the head should have equal time to express his or her views on how individual trustee performance can be improved and on how the workings of the board may be modified to achieve more efficient operation or more decisive action.

A Concurrent Step: Head Self-Evaluation

Once the board is at work on its self-evaluation, it is time for the head to put on paper the results of such self-analysis and soul searching as he or she may have been carrying out.

In "Presidential Evaluation," Barry Munitz comments that any head today is caught between rising expectations of accountability and declining flexibility of action. According to Munitz, the more complex any institution becomes, and the more diffuse its focus of decision making, the harder it gets for the head to determine how good a job he or she is doing. At the same time, it becomes more and more difficult for the individual trustee to upgrade casual observations to a usefully accurate appraisal of the top administrator's performance.

To bring order to all these variables, Munitz urges that the head prepare a written statement for the board. Such a statement is particularly useful for a new head because it allows him or her to state, clearly and in writing, a general philosophy and a set of objectives. It is easy for early disagreement between board and head to develop from misunderstanding or inaccurate recall of what was said when the new head was interviewed. A written statement reminds the head of the obligations originally undertaken and commits the board to support the head, provided he or she is carrying out the agreed-upon policies, successfully or not.

Because some misunderstandings are bound to crop up when previously unacquainted people agree to work together, and because some of the original objectives will probably not be achieved as easily as had been hoped, a joint resolution, accepted in advance, forces everyone to work together in resolving difficulties and diminishes the chance that the board will unfairly blame the head for inadequacy.

The same principle applies later on, for even a well-established head can be misinterpreted or not make his or her point sufficiently clear.

Munitz says that a good statement should cover at least the following.

1. The head's expectations and objectives for the coming school year, and, with less specificity, farther into the future. A new head can also include comments on the search process.

2. Assessment of success to date as measured against those objectives.

3. Initial assumptions as modified by present knowledge.

4. Principal current issues facing the head.

5. Initial objectives as revised to deal with current issues.

6. Leadership criteria based on past years as head.

7. Thoughts about who ought to review the statement of objectives, who might work on it in the context of institutional evaluation, and what kind of responses would be most useful to the head and to the school. Someone with considerable management expertise should certainly be involved in a review of objectives and in the evaluation of results.

Obviously this position paper of the head will vary considerably in form and content depending on length of time in office, overall strength of the school, and the existing state of board/head relations. Writing such a paper offers a singular opportunity for honest self-appraisal and for identifying strengths and recognizing weaknesses in the institution.

This is the time to face up to personal "style"--to recognize what one does well and what one perhaps can't do, at least under the present organization or circumstances. While the paper can include suggestions for changes in organization, either by overcoming or working around shortcomings, the final decision on any of these changes should come out of joint meetings of the head with the trustees in which goals, objectives, and procedures can be revised, mutually understood, and recorded.

Evaluation of the Head by the Trustees

Once the head's self-appraisal has been prepared and circulated to the

board, any number of next steps are possible. Some boards ask each trustee to submit written comments on the head's statement and on the head's performance--either in essay form or in response to a questionnaire. In other cases, only the executive committee of the board or an ad hoc committee appointed by the board chairman performs this exercise. Still other boards omit this step and proceed directly to discussion with the head of his or her self-evaluation. Only rarely does the full board take this step, since open discussion with everyone participating is difficult in any group larger than the average executive committee.

Whatever form the meeting itself may take, the board chairman should summarize (and also probably rank) the main points made and conclusions agreed upon in a written report that is given to the head for his or her immediate and future guidance. Such a written report also serves as a review of progress to date and the logical starting point for trustees whenever the next evaluation is to begin.

Timetable for Evaluation

Scheduling the various steps in an evaluation varies all over the calendar. The only general point of agreement is that spring is not a good time. The earlier in the school year the better, simply because it is important to have firm mutual understanding on goals before getting into specifics of budgeting for the following year or into contract talks with teachers. If evaluation can be accomplished in the fall or early winter, the previous nine or 12 months can be used to evaluate success or shortcomings, with the greater portion of the current academic year still ahead in which to take action on whatever changes in policy, organization, or job performance are agreed upon.

Some Concluding Thoughts on Evaluation

In bemoaning the shrinking tenure of school heads, speaker after speaker at recent NAIS meetings and at many meetings of regional and state groups has offered dozens of explanations--increasing complexity of the job, heightened competition for students, inflationary pressures, faculty unrest and assertiveness, mediocre performance by and lack of stability within boards of trustees--all leading to excessive psychological demands on the head.

Whatever the combination of negative forces at work, independent schools face the same problem of which Clark Kerr, writing as chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in 1970, spoke, when he said that the availability of good people to be presidents of colleges and universities was the ultimate test of the survival of the higher education system and that the faith of these individuals and their "willingness to try" was the principal current resource of higher education.

To which Barry Munitz appends these words of wisdom, at the close of his essay, "Presidential Evaluation."

> A crucial factor in finding and keeping strong leaders will be the enhanced stability that a more sophisticated selection and review process can provide and a better understanding of the matrix of forces within which a president [head] must work. The danger at the moment is that our finest people will be driven away by crude assessment devices. Our challenge is to strengthen the person and the office. If that objective is achieved, then the institution as well as those whom it serves cannot help but benefit.

Just as there is a whole series of causes for the less than secure situation in which most school heads find themselves today, so there are many ways to achieve greater stability in the relations between the head and the board of trustees. In a number of schools, probably the smaller

day schools in the main, head/trustee personal contact is still so constant that informal evaluation goes along on a week-by-week basis. But for most NAIS schools, the time has come for some kind of systematic assessment of progress toward long-range planning goals as well as shorter-term, specific objectives, which should be spelled out in order of priority by the board when the head is hired.

How long the head stays hired--not just "stays hired," but strong in educational leadership and in managing an efficient operation--may very well depend more on systematic and empathetic evaluation than on any other single exercise in which the trustees and head collaborate.

## APPENDIXES A-J

Appendixes A-I contain descriptions of evaluation processes in effect at a number of NAIS member schools. Most were provided by the heads of the schools in response to our special request. We acknowledge with sincere appreciation their important contribution to this advisory. Appendix J reproduces the Self-Study Criteria for Governing Boards of Private Colleges and Universities, published by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

These materials make it immediately clear that there are many possible approaches to evaluation, at once confirming and underlining the point stressed in the text that, to be successful, whatever evaluation process is used must be designed jointly by board and head to fit their particular expectations and requirements.

There is no "better" or "best" process. What appears to work well in one situation might be a disaster in another. Among the examples provided here, readers will undoubtedly find certain procedures that appeal particularly to them. We trust, however, that no one will be tempted to adopt wholesale any of these possible methods on the assumption that it will automatically work well in his or her school.

## APPENDIX A

The process and timetable summarized below are those followed by a school that has had longer experience than most in conducting all three facets of evaluation: self-evaluation by the board, evaluation of the head by the board, and evaluation of the board by the head.

### Head's Evaluation by the Board

| | |
|---|---|
| When | January |
| How often | Yearly |
| Who | Every member of the Board |
| How | It has been found to be beneficial to have two or three different instruments which are used on a rotating basis over a three-year period, at which time we start repeating the use of these instruments. This permits the Board to focus on different areas, and it also stimulates their thinking since the questions are somewhat different. I find it helpful because it provides me with a wealth of information over a three-year period. Sometimes evaluating the same thing each year becomes repetitive and almost meaningless. |

The President and/or Executive Committee summarizes the replies for the benefit of the whole Board, and discusses it with them at a time when I am absent. After that, I sit down with the President and go over this summary.

### Board Self-Evaluation

| | |
|---|---|
| When | February or March |
| How often | Every two or three years |
| Who | All members |
| How | Questionnaire |

The President of the Board summarizes the answers and reports back to the full Board.

### Head's Evaluation of the Board

Over the past few years I have made reports to the President of the Board and once to the full Board--an evaluation which was primarily divided into two parts, as indicated below.

The composition and structure of our Board is such that a person is usually not President more than a maximum of three years; in addition, one third of the members are elected each year for a three-year term, and no member may

serve more than two consecutive terms. Therefore, it is important that I work with the Board President on the evaluation process.

I would like to comment on the accompanying instruments. The two items marked #1 were used in 1976; #1-A was given to the Board for informational purposes, at the same time that #1-B was given to the Board for their evaluation. At my request, #1-B was also given to the faculty. The faculty and Board evaluations were compared in my conference with the President of the Board. However, the faculty summary was more for my own personal use and was not given to the full Board. The results of the questionnaire completed by the Board members were summarized by the President and given to the full Board. This past year, enclosure #2 was given to the Board. As you will see, I described my efforts at completing four objectives given to me prior to the beginning of the school year. The second sheet, #2-A, served two purposes--Head evaluation and objectives for the Board for the next year. Item #3 is the actual evaluation which I made of the Board a year ago. Item #4 is a form the Board used several years ago for its own self-evaluation.

School Head

## 1-A. Self-Evaluation by Head

I. Approximate allotment of time

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| a. | Curriculum and program | 10-20% |
| b. | Student contact | 10-20% |
| c. | Parent contact | 5- 8% |
| d. | Faculty contact | 20-30% |
| e. | Trustee contact | 5-10% |
| f. | Development and public relations | 10-15% |
| g. | Administrative | 20-30% |

II. Typical weekly schedule
- a. Regularly scheduled weekly meetings - 7
  1. Finance Manager
  2. Director of Development
  3. Principals
  4. Congress
  5. Guidance Counselor
  6. Director of Curriculum and Research
  7. Athletic Director
- b. Faculty conferences - 2-4
- c. Parent conferences - 1-3
- d. Telephone calls - 30-50
- e. Night meetings - 0-3
- f. Visiting areas of school daily
- g. Daily morning assembly
- h. Saturday activities - conferences, meetings, games

III. I believe the Head should
- a. Carry out by-laws and stated philosophy of the school.
- b. Supervise the day-to-day operation of the school.
- c. Carry out policies of the Board.
- d. Suggest new policies to the Board for adoption.
- e. Plan for the fucure through anticipation and planning.
- f. Act as a Head figuratively and literally for students, parents, Trustees, alumni, and friends.
- g. Keep a proper balance between tradition and change.
- h. Keep faculty informed of the Board's actions and vice versa.
- i. Believe that a good school can always become better.
- j. Expect and appreciate constructive and objective criticism and suggestions.
- k. Initiate the development of a budget and control the budget as approved by the Board.
- l. Act as a statesman in the best sense of the word.
- m. Operate in a way to be in contact with students, faculty, parents, and Trustees.
- n. Protect the rights of all constituents and be a fair judge in conflicts between constituents.
- o. Absorb the anxieties produced by hearsay, rumor, and unsubstantiated stories.

p. Make decisions as quickly as facts can be accumulated and inform all interested parties.
q. Stimulate faculty to become better teachers.
r. Stimulate Trustees to become better Board members.
s. Work hard.
t. Have a summer vacation to relax, contemplate, and refresh body and mind for the next year.
u. Be involved in community and regional educational groups.
v. Represent the school seven days a week wherever he is.
w. Actively find applicants for the school.
x. React positively to changes, personal criticism.
y. Include his wife as a partner on the job.
z. Seek donors for capital gifts to the school.
aa. Be a sympathetic friend for students and faculty without playing favorites.
bb. Establish a discipline system which has a caring authority for the individual student.
cc. Make the hard, big decision on all major problems of discipline involving students or faculty.
dd. Hire the best staff available to meet the needs of the school.
ee. Pursue the best salary scale for the staff to protect them and their families.
ff. Establish for the faculty and staff a system of decision making, areas of responsibility, and lines of communication.
gg. Keep students clearly informed of policies, rules, and procedures to prevent misunderstanding and ignorance.
hh. Strive for an atmosphere of friendship, trust, and love within the school.
ii. Rise above petty gripes and grievances.
jj. Maintain a proper perspective and objectivity toward all problems.
kk. Recognize and respect the diversification of family philosophies.

January 1976

## 1-B. Evaluation of the Head

To assist in the evaluation of our Head, I [the President of the Board] have outlined below a brief statement of his principal responsibilities and am requesting that, with this statement in mind, you answer the questions listed below. I will compile the answers of the Board and review the results with the Head in an evaluation review. If there are any questions you do not feel you can answer, leave those blank. Any additional comments you might wish to offer that would be of constructive help in increasing his effectiveness as Head would be appreciated. On those questions asking that a grade of excellence from 1 to 5 be given, 1 represents excellent, 2 good, 3 fair, 4 poor, and 5 definitely needs improvement. A space is provided under each question for any comments you feel would be of assistance. For ratings of 4 or 5, it would be particularly helpful if you would make specific comments.

> The Head is the school's executive officer, responsible for carrying out its by-laws and stated philosophy. He assists in establishing and administering the annual budget. He is responsible for maintaining a competent staff and faculty. The Head is expected to plan for the future, suggesting to the Board of Trustees any new policies for adoption, and is responsible for keeping the faculty, students, parents, trustees, and the community informed regarding the school's problems and accomplishments.

| | (Ex) | (Gd) | (Fr) | (Pr) | (Def. needs imp.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. How do you grade the Head as a leader? | 1____ | 2____ | 3____ | 4____ | 5____ |
| 2. How do you grade the Head as an administrator? | 1____ | 2____ | 3____ | 4____ | 5____ |
| 3. What are his areas of strength? | | | | | |
| 4. What are his areas of weakness? | | | | | |
| 5. How well has the Head administered the budget? | 1____ | 2____ | 3____ | 4____ | 5____ |
| 6. To what extent do you feel the head has succeeded in maintaining a competent and stable faculty and administrative staff? | 1____ | 2____ | 3____ | 4____ | 5____ |

| | | (Ex) | (Gd) | (Fr) | (Pr) | (Def. needs imp.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7. | How well has he fulfilled his responsibility of bringing to the faculty's attention new policies for adoption and been involved in planning the school's future? | 1____ | 2____ | 3____ | 4____ | 5____ |
| 8. | How well does the Head keep the faculty informed of major aspects of the School's operation? | 1____ | 2____ | 3____ | 4____ | 5____ |
| 9. | If question 8 is graded 3 or below, please explain areas of communication which need improvement. | | | | | |
| 10. | Do you feel that the Head is fully involved in the total program of the school, which is defined as including academics, activities, and athletics? | 1____ | 2____ | 3____ | 4____ | 5____ |
| 11. | The admissions and college placement results are indirectly a reflection of the Head's administration and policies. To what degree to you feel they have been successful? | 1____ | 2____ | 3____ | 4____ | 5____ |
| 12. | In what regard do you feel the Head is held by | | | | | |
| | A. Students | 1____ | 2____ | 3____ | 4____ | 5____ |
| | B. Alumni | 1____ | 2____ | 3____ | 4____ | 5____ |
| | C. Community | 1____ | 2____ | 3____ | 4____ | 5____ |

GENERAL COMMENTS:

It is not necessary that you sign this appraisal. Please place in sealed envelope which will be given to the President of the Board of Trustees.

## 2. Objectives for the Head - 1976-77

1. Bring to completion Phases I and II of Building Program

   Although about $1,500 worth of work must be done on the solar unit of the Fine Arts Building, Phases I and II of the Building Program have been completed. The total amount of money raised through gifts and pledges exceeds the total cost for Phases I and II and permits the school to allocate $16,000 for repairs and an addition to the Head's house.

2. Reorganize the administrative responsibilities presently held by Mr. Jones in anticipation of his retirement.

   I have completed the redistribution of administrative responsibilities now held by Mr. Jones. Next year Mr. Wood will be Principal of Grades 9 and 10; Mr. Phillips, Director of Admission; Mr. Porter, Coordinator of College Counseling; Mr. Roberts, Supervisor of Maintenance.

3. Work toward upgrading of faculty through retraining and teacher evaluation procedures.

   Two workshops were held this year for the faculty in the area of communications. Dr. Deaton of the Athyn Group was our professional consultant in both of these. In addition, a plan was devised whereby the minutes of each Department meeting are distributed to the other members of the faculty. The faculty study account of $19,000 was completely used during the summer and winter for the purpose of upgrading the faculty and curriculum. Our teacher evaluation plan is a two-page document which each teacher has and which I use as a guideline in evaluation. (This was distributed at a Trustee meeting.)

4. Evaluate curricula offering and teacher assignments.

   Evaluating the curriculum is an ongoing process. The 1977-78 Curriculum Guide recently given to all students includes some changes but nothing major. The selection of five new teachers from a large group of qualified candidates along with greater use of part-time professional people (i.e., modern dance, gymnastics, etc.), I believe, has resulted in a more equitable assignment of teachers for next year.

2-A

I. Trustee evaluation of Head's achievement of objectives:

II. Suggested objectives for 1977-78 Board:

III. Preferred committee assignments:

### 3. Head's Evaluation of the Board of Trustees

I. Areas of Unusual Strength
1. Committed to the philosophy and objectives of the school.
2. Attendance at Board and Committee meetings.
3. Support of the Head.
4. Support of the faculty and staff.
5. Expertise, knowledge, and experience of Board members.
6. Personal initiative to suggest new ideas for school improvement.
7. Supervision of budget, investments, and teacher benefits.
8. Responsiveness to new ideas of the Head.
9. Cooperative spirit of Board members.
10. Honest and frank discussion at meetings.
11. Effective organization of Committee structure and their objectives
12. Orientation of new Trustees.
13. Printed policies and guidelines.

II. Areas To Be Considered for Some Improvement
1. Analysis and study of material sent to Board members prior to the regular meetings.
2. Drawing conclusions about the operation of the school from inadequate information or rumors.
3. Involvement in raising funds for endowment and capital purposes.
4. At Board meetings, rejecting the urge to interject the role of a parent in place of that of a Trustee.
5. Lack of response to my requests each fall for Trustees to suggest agenda items for Board meetings, and to my suggestions contained in the annual report submitted in September.
6. Since the accumulation of a large endowment fund several years ago, the full Board has not objectively evaluated the investment performances of the school's money manager.
7. Visiting school while the school is in session.

## 4. The Effectiveness of Our Board

1. Below are listed some characteristics that describe different areas of Board effectiveness. How would you rate our board <u>as a whole</u> on each?

| | How do you rate our Board? Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Diversity: The Board as a whole contains the necessary diversity of talents, skills, experience, and interests among its members to complement one another and to strengthen the whole Board. | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| b. Structure: The Board is structured in such a way that individuals and/or committees assume a proper, active, and effective role in the operation and activities of the Board. | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| c. Member Involvement: Members demonstrate a high degree of interest in the institution and in their role and responsibilities as Trustees; they are genuinely involved in the institution's problems and prospects. | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| d. Knowledgeability: The members of the board are well-informed about the institution, its place in the educational system, and in the currents of society affecting education. | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| e. Rapport: The members of the Board have mutual respect for each other, regardless of differences of opinion, and maintain an effective working relationship with each other. | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| f. Sense of Priorities: Board members, and the Board as a body, tend to be concerned with important and long-range issues rather than with trivial matters. | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| g. Sensitivity: The Board is representative of, or sensitive to, different constituencies and viewpoints. | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |

| | How do you rate our Board? Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| h. Strength: The Board is strong enough to achieve effective educational policy decisions in the face of extraneous political or other outside pressures. | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| i. Financial Support: The Board contains a reasonable number of members who provide or help get financial support. | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| j. Accomplishment: The Board has a genuine sense of progress and achievement, and members derive satisfaction from their service. | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |

k. What direction or emphasis do you believe the Board should concentrate on next year?

_____

_____

_____

_____

1976

## APPENDIX B

This school spent three years developing these procedures for evaluating both head and board.

### 1. Procedures for Board Evaluation of the Head

As the first step, I asked that provision of an annual evaluation of my performance be included in the "Memorandum of Understanding" between myself and the President of the Board of Trustees. The evaluation takes place at the March or April Board meeting although, ideally, the date should be pushed back to January or February. Since our Board is relatively new at this, it takes a good deal of preparation and energy to crank them up for the process.

Two years ago, after consultation with individual Board members, I drew up a series of traits, characteristics, or qualities which I felt our Board should expect of the Head. In order to be representative, this list must be revised each year in view of changes in my competency and the needs of the school. These items are then put in the form of questions or objectives and a space is provided for each Board member to rate my performance in that area. Our current rating sheet is attached.

After the list of characteristics has been prepared, I present it to the President of the Board and also the Chairman of the Education Committee for their comments and then write it up in final form and send it out to the Board members. A cover letter explains that this format will be used for the evaluation and Trustees are asked to give their ratings and send them to the President. The President then collates these ratings and brings them to the April Board meeting for discussion during the actual evaluation, at which time I, and any other colleagues, are excused from the meeting. A summary statement is prepared by the President reflecting the consensus of the Board discussion. He meets with me after the Board meeting either that evening or the next day and relays to me in detail the full results of the Board's evaluation. These verbal comments are then followed by letter.

### 2. Criteria Used

Additional input for the evaluation is secured by the Chairman of the Education Committee who, with another committee member, visits the school for a morning and talks informally with teachers about how the school is going, faculty feelings about a variety of issues, and generally sensing how the place "feels." These Trustees are carefully coached by the President to be mindful of the delicacy of their position and to keep the discussions on a level of "all school" rather than "What don't you like about the Head." The faculty perceive this visit as an extension of Trustee interest in the school and no announcement is made that Trustees are coming to evaluate the Head. The impressions of the visiting Trustees are included in the Board meeting discussions of my performance.

Also, the two committee members talk privately with the faculty representatives to the Board meetings further along these lines and so far, this practice has proved to be beneficial to the Trustees and a source of satisfaction to the faculty.

The Head should consider one of his chief responsibilities careful orientation and preparation of the Board of Trustees for this job. In my particular case, it took three years to convince the Trustees they should even evaluate me. Now that they've done it for two years in a row, it has become an integral part of the annual ebb and flow of our relationship.

3. Annual Self-Evaluation of the Board

This may be the most unique aspect of our annual evaluation procedure. After the Trustees have evaluated my performance, they allow me to evaluate their performance but in the context of a self-evaluation. I initiate this self-evaluation and prepare, with their advice and consent, some queries which include the basic responsibilities of the Board. I offer these queries to the Board and it takes as many as two meetings to go through them and to engage in an honest and soul-searching discussion. The way in which I evaluate the Board is to inject my opinions at those points where I feel it is warranted. The whole self-evaluation (including my comments) is then written up and distributed to the Board and approved (with any changes) at the next meeting. Our Board members have found this to be a useful exercise. One indication of this is the fact that I was critical of the Board's effectiveness in financing the school. The result was that this year's Annual Giving is almost twice what it's been any other year.

## Evaluation of the Head

DIRECTIONS: Grade the Head in accordance with the grading system below for only those factors below of which you have real knowledge of this individual.

Grading basis:

5 Consistently outstanding!
4 Generally above expected level: occasionally outstanding
3 Generally at expected level: occasionally above
2 Generally at expected level: occasionally below
1 Below expected level
? I have no opinion or knowledge on this

| | Personal Knowledge | General Impression |
|---|---|---|
| I. POSITION PERFORMANCE - How well he carries out the duties of his present job | | |
| 1. Technical knowledge - The knowledge of functional skills needed to carry out position requirements. | ____ | ____ |
| 2. Accomplishment - Effective use of time. Amount of work produced. | ____ | ____ |
| 3. Quality - Accuracy and thoroughness. High standards. | ____ | ____ |
| 4. Dependability - Meets schedules and deadlines. Adheres to instructions and policy. | ____ | ____ |
| 5. Acuteness - Mentally alert. Understands instructions, explanations, unusual situations and circumstances quickly. | ____ | ____ |
| 6. Flexibility - Adaptable. Adjusts rapidly to changing conditions. Copes with the unexpected. | ____ | ____ |
| 7. Socialness - Makes friends easily. Works "comfortably" with others. Has sincere interest in people. | ____ | ____ |
| 8. Acceptance - Gains confidence of others; gains respect. | ____ | ____ |

| | | Personal Knowledge | General Impression |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9. | Attitude - Enthusiastic, constructive, optimistic, loyal. Good orientation to school, position, and associates. | ____ | ____ |
| 10. | Self-control - Calm and poised under pressure. | ____ | ____ |
| 11. | Initiative - Self-starting. Prompt to take hold of a problem. Sees and acts on new opportunities. | ____ | ____ |
| 12. | Drive - Works with energy. Not easily discouraged. Basic urge to get things done. | ____ | ____ |
| 13. | Self-confidence - Assured bearing. Inner security. | ____ | ____ |
| 14. | Motivation - Has well-planned goals. Willingly assumes greater responsibilities. Realistically ambitious. | ____ | ____ |
| 15. | Objectivity - Has an open mind. Keeps emotional or personal interests from influencing decisions. | ____ | ____ |
| 16. | Verbal Facility - Articulate. Communicative - generally understood by persons at all levels. | ____ | ____ |
| 17. | Intellectual Ability - Ability to solve problems, to adapt to new situations, to analyze and make judgments. | ____ | ____ |
| 18. | Human Relations Skill - Ability to motivate people and get them to work together. | ____ | ____ |
| 19. | Sensitivity - Has a "feel" for people, recognizes their problems. Quick to pick up "the way the wind is blowing." Is considerate of others. | ____ | ____ |
| 20. | Leadership - Receives loyalty and cooperation from others. Manages and motivates others to full effectiveness. | ____ | ____ |
| 21. | Developing Others - Develops competent successors and replacements. | ____ | ____ |

| | Personal Knowledge | General Impression |
|---|---|---|
| 22. Breadth of Knowledge - Range of interests. Use of information and concepts from other related fields of knowledge. | ____ | ____ |
| 23. Planning - Looks ahead. Develops programs and work schedules. | ____ | ____ |
| 24. Administration - Organizes own work and that of others. Delegation, follow-up, control of position activities. | ____ | ____ |
| 25. Analysis and Judgment - Critical observer, breaks problem into components, weighs and relates: arrives at sound conclusions. | ____ | ____ |
| 26. Creativeness - Original ideas; an inquiring mind; fresh approaches to problems. | ____ | ____ |
| 27. Capacity - Mental depth and breadth; reservoir of mental ability. | ____ | ____ |
| 28. Vision - Has foresight; sees new opportunities. Appreciates, but not bound by, tradition or custom. | ____ | ____ |
| II. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS - The total of temperament or personality characteristics bearing on his functioning. | | |
| 1. Demonstrates convincing sincerity in his dealings with people. | ____ | ____ |
| 2. Has a sense of humor appropriate to the occasion. | ____ | ____ |
| 3. Is resilient - can handle setbacks maturely and learn from mistakes. | ____ | ____ |
| 4. Has rapport with: Faculty | ____ | ____ |
| Students | ____ | ____ |
| Trustees | ____ | ____ |
| Parents | ____ | ____ |
| Others outside the school | ____ | ____ |

| | Personal Knowledge | General Impression |
|---|---|---|
| 5. Represents the school effectively in the community. | _____ | _____ |
| 6. Can be empathetic with a number of alternatives on a problem, yet be detached enough not to be "caught up" in the issue. Able to come to his own independent decision. | _____ | _____ |
| 7. Demonstrates balance between being a "humanist" and a manager. | _____ | _____ |

III. IN GENERAL

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Carries out the educational policy set by the Board. | _____ | _____ |
| 2. The Head has selected strong and effective principals and department heads who can guide their instructors, evaluate them, and improve their capabilities. | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Initiates, plans, and reviews departmental budgets as prelude to annual budget and works effectively with the Finance Committee to review budget prior to submitting it to the Board. | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Acts within the financial policy set by the Board. | _____ | _____ |
| 5. Provides the spark for initiating a fund-raising campaign started with the Board's prior approval as to method, goal, and purpose. | _____ | _____ |
| 6. Effective at deriving the greatest possible benefit from limited financial and plant resources. | _____ | _____ |

IV. SUMMARY

1. Please list what you believe are the Head's three main strengths in his position:

   a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

2. Please list the three areas in which you would like to see the Head improve in the coming year:

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

## Queries for Trustees

### I. STRUCTURE

1. Does the Board operate under a clear and up-to-date set of by-laws with which all Trustees are familiar?

2. Are members of and nominees to the Board representative of the school's clientele, and do they have talents which qualify them to serve?

3. Is the Board organized to deal effectively with its responsibilities? (Officers, committee structure, length, frequency, and format of meetings)

### II. DECISION MAKING

4. How are Board decisions made? Are all appropriate people involved? Is there a procedure for decision making? If so, is it followed?

### III. RESPONSIBILITIES

5. Does each Board member have a clear idea of the responsibilities involved in trusteeship? Does each Trustee do his best to contribute time, energy, and resources to the school?

6. Has the Board developed a philosophy of what kind of school they want, what direction they want it to go, and a set of clear policy guidelines?

7. Is the Board careful to observe the scope and limits of its responsibilities and those of the school administration?

8. Is the relationship between the Board and the Head such that each can communicate openly and frankly with the other when necessary?

9. Has the Board collectively and individually done its best to provide sufficient financial resources for a high quality K-12 day school?

10. Has the Board done the best it can to promote the school in the community?

11. Does each Board member demonstrate a personal interest in the school and attempt to stay abreast of educational developments in the school?

12. Are new Board members promptly and effectively oriented to their responsibilities and opportunities?

13. Does the Board provide for a regular evaluation of its own performance as well as for that of the Head and the school program?

14. Does the Board maintain good communication with its own constituents and the school community?

15. Does each Board member exercise care and judgment in the handling of any complaints, grievances, or problems which may come to his attention?

16. Is the Board responsible, careful, and forward-thinking in its financial management?

17. Does the Board make an effort to know the employees of the school and take an interest in them as individuals?

## APPENDIX C

The head of this school has been evaluated annually for several years, and the first steps are now being taken toward board self-evaluation.

1. Evaluation of the Head

   A. Early December: In past years, I have had to remind the Board Chairman that it is time for my "annual checkup." Now it is built into the annual cycle of normal Board activity. We decide each year if there are any Trustees other than those on the Executive Committee (which includes chairmen of Development, Endowment, Finance, Planning, and Program committees) who should be asked to participate.

   B. Mid-December: The Board Chairman invites the Executive Committee to a lunch with the sole agenda item being the evaluation of the Head's performance. Last year we completed our Middle States Evaluation and I suggested he try amending their forms to our needs. He did that (copy attached) and asked each member to complete it--circle the right number--prior to the luncheon. They then met to reach a consensus on the "numbers," provide footnotes and examples of areas where they considered my performance particularly weak or strong, and outline other areas of concern that they felt would be useful to me.

   C. Late December/Early January: The Chairman meets with me to review the feelings of the Executive Committee, give to me a copy of their completed evaluation forms, and review with me the highlights of their meeting. He also gives me a copy of his notes--handwritten--taken during this Executive Committee meeting. We also discuss salary for the coming year. The overall level of enthusiasm is reflected in his final contract letter sent to me in January which sets my salary for the following year, with the same salary and benefits being guaranteed for the second year following as well. Example: In January 1977 I received a contract at X dollars for 1977-78 and a minimum of X dollars for 1978-79.

   In steps B and C, goals and objectives are discussed but not recorded in a final way so that a future evaluation can be made with reference to previously agreed upon criteria.

2. We have no formal Evaluation of the Board. This year (1977-78) we have asked each committee to review its own role and set objectives for the year.

   This fall the Chairman and I ran a Trustee workshop as part of our first meeting and asked the Trustees to take a test which they then corrected

individually themselves (à la fifth grade math class--"No looking at your neighbors' grades," etc.). Answers were weighted according to the importance of the areas: Questions 1-7 having to do with incidental knowledge of school life, 8-24 having to do with Trustee business, and 25-30 having to do with $! As you can see from the enclosed answer sheet, we were trying to make them realize that we think giving and getting money is very important to the school at this point in time.

We then asked them to break into small groups and consider our weighting of answers--thereby moving toward their own statement of priorities. It was a fun evening and, I think, a productive one.

School Head

## Executive Committee

## Evaluation of Head--Checklist

Rating Scale: na--not applicable; 1--Poor; 2--Fair; 3--Good; 4--Excellent

| Section I | Rating |
|---|---|
| 1. Exhibits a well-formulated philosophy of education. | ____ |
| 2. Keeps the Board of Trustees informed, through periodic reports, regarding the school's objectives, achievements, needs, and plans for the future. | ____ |
| 3. Plans and presents annually the budget for consideration by the Board of Trustees. | ____ |
| 4. Arranges for the accounting system to be organized in sufficient detail to make computations of important unit costs possible. | ____ |
| 5. Administers or supervises the administration of the business affairs of the school. | ____ |
| 6. Supervises all school employees in the performance of their duties. | ____ |
| 7. Recommends professional and nonprofessional employees for appointment on the basis of their qualifications for particular services. | ____ |
| 8. Involves the staff and faculty in formulating recommendations, policies, and the budget. | ____ |
| 9. Secures the cooperation of the staff in carrying out recommendations and policies. | ____ |
| 10. Facilitates the professional improvement of the staff. | ____ |
| 11. Assists in the coordination of school and community activities. | ____ |
| 12. Considers the availability of community or other resources in arriving at practical solutions to educational problems. | ____ |
| 13. Participates in a continuing program of self-improvement. | ____ |
| 14. Provides the community with educational leadership. | ____ |

Section II

| | Rating |
|---|---|
| 1. Assists staff members in improving the articulation and continuity of all aspects of the school program, both within grades and between grades. | ____ |
| 2. Affords appropriate opportunities for staff members to share in the administration of the school. | ____ |
| 3. Helps new teachers to begin their work with confidence and to become constructive members of the staff. | ____ |
| 4. Helps all staff members to attain a feeling of security and satisfaction in their work. | ____ |
| 5. Encourages the professional growth of his teachers and helps them to develop to their highest potential. | ____ |
| 6. Works with parent-teacher and other organizations to improve the service that the school renders to students and the community. | ____ |
| 7. Formulates plans in cooperation with staff members for the improvement of the educational program. | ____ |
| 8. Stimulates the staff to initiate and carry out curriculum studies. | ____ |
| 9. Arranges a variety of educational activities, such as workshops, conferences, and individual and group research projects. | ____ |
| 10. Aids in the development of a professional library. | ____ |
| 11. Provides opportunities for teachers to observe the work of other schools, clinics, or related services. | ____ |
| 12. Recognizes, on personnel records, by letters of commendation, or other means, instances of unusual professional growth or educational achievement. | ____ |
| 13. Encourages staff members to seek ways of promoting moral and spiritual values through school activities. | ____ |
| 14. Provides or maintains an environment that is conducive to educational growth and development. | ____ |

## Trustee Report Card

1. The school has a ratio of boys to girls of about:

   (A) 1:1 (B) 2:1 (C) 3:1 (D) 1:2 _____

2. The enrollment of the Middle School is about:

   (A) 150 (B) 180 (C) 210 _____

3. Approximately how many full-time employees are there on the Administration and Faculty (excluding clerical and maintenance crew)?

   (A) 60 (B) 90 (C) 120 _____

4. Who is Chairman of the Science Department? _____

5. The school currently requires _____ years of English in grades 9-12. _____

6. Who was the recipient of the Jones Award in June 1977? _____

7. Students are required to participate in athletics in each trimester. True___ False___

8. Have I read or thought about the school's Statement of Philosophy since I became a Trustee? Yes___ No___

9. During my trusteeship, how many ideas have I initiated that have led to effective changes at the school or in the management of its affairs?

   (A) 0 (B) 2-3 (C) 4 or more _____

10. Last year there were 5 full Board meetings. I attended:

    (A) 0 (B) 1 (C) 2 (D) 3 (E) 4 (F) 5 _____

11. Prior to Board meetings, I read all the Committee reports and note areas and points I wish to question. Yes___ No___

12. What is the largest capital gift given to the school in the last 10 years?

(A) $25,000 (B) $75,000 (C) $150,000 (D) $250,000 ____

13. Who chaired the Trustee nominating committee in 1976-77? ____

14. What was the value of the school's Endowment, exclusive of the pension fund, as of the last report?

(A) about $250,000 (B) about $750,000
(C) about $2,000,000 (D) about $5,000,000 ____

15. What was the median faculty salary during the year 1976-77?

(A) about $12,000 (B) about $15,000 (C) about $18,000
(D) about $21,000 ____

16. Is this above the median of the city's public schools for the same year?

Yes___ No___

17. I have been chairman, or an active force in the work of, _____ Trustee committees during the last year.

(A) 0 (B) 1 (C) 2 (D) 3 ____

18. Last year I made an effort _____ times to speak with a teacher socially, talk about his or her feelings about the school, and express my gratitude as a Trustee for the job he or she is doing.

(A) 1-5 (B) 6-10 (C) 11 or more ____

19. During the last year, I have introduced _____ friends to the school not just for fund raising but for public relations in an effort to spread a good image of the school to all communities.

(A) 1-3 (B) 4-6 (C) 7 or more ____

20. During the last year, I have given to the school staff the names of _____ families who should receive admissions materials about the school.

(A) 0 (B) 1-2 (C) 3-5 (D) 6 or more ____

21. How many names of potential trustees did I submit to the Nominating Committee last year?

(A) 0 (B) 1-2 (C) 3 or more ____

22. John Nason, the former president of Carleton College, has stated that a Trustee should persuade the hostile, disarm the critical, spike rumors, correct misunderstandings, refute misstatements, explain the problems of the school, and interpret its premises and principles. In how many conversations during the last year have I achieved one of the above?

(A) 0-5 (B) 6-10 (c) 11-20 (D) over 20 ____

23. If someone asked me tonight what the school needed more than anything, I would say (other than a new administration!):

(A) more capital dollars (B) endowment (C) increased annual giving ____

24. I have given the Development Director the names of ____ prospective donors with information about how, when, and by whom they might be approached for support.

(A) 0 (B) 1-2 (C) 3-5 (D) 6 or more ____

25. During my tenure as a Trustee, I have given to capital programs an amount of:

(A) 0 (B) $1-$4,999 (C) $5,000-$9,999 (D) $10,000-$24,999 (E) $25,000-$49,999 (F) $50,000 or more ____

26. I have successfully solicited:

(A) 0 (B) $1-$4,999 (C) $5,000-$9,999 (D) $10,000-$24,999 (E) $25,000-$49,999 (F) $50,000 or more ____

27. In last year's Annual Giving campaign, I was in the following group:

(A) Founder--$1,000 or more (B) Headmaster's Club--$500-$999 (C) Green Circle--$200-$499
(D) Vanguard--$100-$199 (E) Did not give ____

28. My gift to Annual Giving represented about _____% of my personal income.

(A) 0 - 1/2 of 1% (B) 1/2 of 1% - 1% (C) more than 1%, less than 3% (D) more than 3% _____

29. I gave my pledge or gift during the early part of the drive (before November 1) to encourage solicitors and workers and show Trustee support of Annual Giving. Yes___ No___

30. Realizing the long-term importance of Estate Planning to the school and of total Board support, I have made provisions for the school in my will or a trust. Yes___ No___

## APPENDIX D

The process followed in evaluating the head of this school was established at the time of his employment, in 1973.

1. As a condition of employment it was agreed with the Trustees that the Head would receive an annual written evaluation of his performance.

2. This evaluation is to be completed prior to the Head's rehiring of the faculty for the following year. This means that the process must be completed no later than January.

3. The evaluation is looked upon as a measure of how successfully the Head has achieved the goals and objectives he established for the current academic year. These goals are written during the summer, shared with the Chairman prior to the opening of school, and distributed to the Trustees at the first meeting of the year.

4. All Trustees are invited to submit to the Chairman individual statements regarding their assessment of the Head's performance.

5. Chairman and selected members of the Executive Committee meet with the Head for an open and two-way discussion of the Head's performance.

6. The Chairman summarizes the main points of the evaluation in a written memorandum which is given to the Head.

7. We avoid the use of checklists or standardized instruments and all statements written by the individual Trustees to the Board Chairman are destroyed and never shared with the Head or other Trustees. The only written documents are the Head's objectives, prepared by the Head in the fall, and the final confidential memorandum which is presented to the Head by the Board Chairman along with an offer of re-employment prior to the rehiring of any staff member by the Head.

## APPENDIX E

This school has had four years' experience with evaluating its head and the process has been refined each year.

1. In May each of the Trustees is given a copy of the attached evaluation instrument and asked to utilize it in writing a recommendation of the Head's performance of the past school year. The instrument was developed from a description of the Head's responsibilities in our by-laws. It is the third questionnaire we have used in the last four years and we are still tinkering with it.

2. Once a Trustee has filled out his or her evaluation instrument, it is mailed to the President of the Board, who compiles all of the objective answers in the form of a graph for purposes of statistical analysis. Trustees are encouraged to make open-ended comments for each question, and they are assured that anonymity will be protected.

3. In the early fall of the following school year, the President of the Board sits down with the Head and reviews the results of the objective questions on the questionnaire and shares with him representative open-ended comments. A dialogue then develops regarding specific strengths and needs as well as specific objectives for the new school year.

Our Board has not developed an evaluation program for its own performance as yet, but there has been some discussion of it. We have found, however, that the Board's evaluation of the Head often reveals how active individual Trustees have been and how knowledgeable they are of the school's operation of its programs.

## Head Evaluation Form

Rating scale (circle one): 1--Poor; 2--Improvement Needed; 3--Satisfactory; 4--Excellent; 5--Outstanding

1. Interpersonal Relationships

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| a. | Ability to relate to teaching staff | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| b. | Ability to relate to students | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| c. | Ability to handle difficult teachers, parents, children | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| d. | Ability to convey criticism constructively | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| e. | Ability to accept criticism | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Comments:

2. Empathy

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| a. | Willingness to listen to problems | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| b. | Willingness to help solve problems | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| c. | Willingness to understand other points of view | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Comments:

3. Administrative Style

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| a. | Seeks opinions and ideas of colleagues | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| b. | Listens to opinions and ideas of colleagues | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| c. | Treats staff members as fellow professionals | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| d. | Relates impartially with fellow professionals | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| e. | Relates respectfully with fellow professionals | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| f. | Makes decisions effectively | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| g. | Follows through effectively on decisions | 1 2 3 4 5 |

h. Accepts responsibility for decisions 1 2 3 4 5

i. Deals promptly with matters referred to him 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

4. Ability To Communicate

a. Communicates decisions and rationale for decisions effectively 1 2 3 4 5

b. Ability to be clearly understood 1 2 3 4 5

c. Accessibility to others 1 2 3 4 5

d. Communication with groups and public 1 2 3 4 5

e. Communication on a one-to-one basis 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

5. Organization and Delegation of Responsibility

a. Ability to delegate effectively responsibility and authority 1 2 3 4 5

b. Willingness to delegate effectively responsibility and authority 1 2 3 4 5

c. Ability to meet deadlines, appointments, commitments 1 2 3 4 5

d. Ability to establish priority for responsibilities 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

6. Appointments

a. Ability to recruit outstanding people for the professional staff 1 2 3 4 5

b. Ability to recruit outstanding people for the nonprofessional staff 1 2 3 4 5

c. Ability to make key appointments wihin the professional staff for maximum use of talent available 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

7. Curriculum

a. Success in developing a curriculum commensurate with the purposes and objectives of the school 1 2 3 4 5

b. Ability to bring about regular changes in the curriculum when warranted 1 2 3 4 5

c. Success in utilizing the talents and ideas of the faculty in improving curriculum 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

8. Overall School Management

a. Capacity for leadership in providing for the smooth operation of the school's facilities and services 1 2 3 4 5

b. Success in working with Trustees to provide an effective system of maintenance for the school plant 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

9. Discipline

a. Ability to bring about behavior patterns of the children that are commensurate with their age level expectations as well as with the purposes and objectives of the school 1 2 3 4 5

b. Success in leading the faculty in their role toward meeting these ends 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

10. Loyalty

a. Success in supporting the faculty and staff in the face of unwarranted criticism from parents or from other constituents 1 2 3 4 5

b. Success in supporting and aiding trustees in the performance of their role as a governing body without yielding the exclusive responsibilities of a Head 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

11. Admissions

a. Ability to recruit and hold students whose needs are best served by the purposes and objectives of the school 1 2 3 4 5

b. Success in attracting qualified financial aid candidates without sacrificing admissions standards 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

12. Secondary School Placements

a. Success in finding schools which appropriately meet needs of the individual student 1 2 3 4 5

b. Ability to provide thorough and comprehensive guidance to student and parents throughout the process of school search and application 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

## APPENDIX F

In this school, evaluation has, for several years, combined formal and highly informal procedures.

Our evaluation methods are very informal but we feel effective.

We do not have any real procedure for evaluation of the Board itself. Our committee system works very effectively, so the Trustees see quite a bit of each other in the course of the school year. I am sure that as a result of this some feeling of Trustee evaluation/accountability takes place. Occasionally, the President of the Board discusses Trustee effectiveness with me, but not in any official sense at all.

The Trustees' evaluation of the Head really takes many forms. I would say that in some respects I am evaluated almost weekly. I have lunch with the President (and we are joined by one or two other trustees) about once every ten days and sometimes it is more frequent than that. Usually, at these lunches, I receive an evaluation not only of my work but of the school's progress in general. These sessions are rarely of a totally critical nature, but more advisory, and I feel of great value to me.

The "formal" evaluation is made every January by the Executive Committee of the Board. I am present for all of that session with the exception of the few minutes they excuse me to discuss my salary for the succeeding year.

During the "evaluation" part of the meeting, there is open discussion about the progress of the school, my handling of particular aspects (faculty relations, parent relations, Trustee relations, etc.), and any concerns or questions I have about our operations. The members of the Executive Committee have usually talked with other Trustees before the meeting so that their questions and comments reflect the feelings of other Trustees who are not present at the evaluation session. I sometimes follow up on these comments by inviting individual Trustees to lunch, particularly if there is any real concern or criticism on the part of any one of them. Following the evaluation meeting, I meet with the President to "evaluate" the meeting itself. This is done very informally.

All in all, I feel very comfortable with our "system" of evaluation. It is very helpful to me and the major value seems to be that neither "side" lets anything fester over a period of time because the almost-weekly lunches keep us in touch with each other. In addition, I talk with the President almost daily on the telephone, just little keep-in-touch chats. Frankly, I almost dread the day our current Trustee President leaves the board. Much of the success of this school is due to his sensible, intelligent, and sensitive leadership. I level with him about every problem I face in my job (small or large) because I can expect an honest and intelligent response. I think he feels equally free to do the same with me.

School Head

## APPENDIX G

This school is different from most in that it draws heavily on faculty opinion in evaluating the head.

A. Procedure

1. In February, or thereabouts, I do a self-evaluation.

2. At almost the same time, all faculty and staff do an anonymous parallel evaluation of me.

3. A faculty member (of my choosing) collects these faculty responses and presents the aggregate results to me (privately) and to a small committee of the Board.

4. The Board Committee and I discuss the results, in March or April.

B. Advantages

1. I can measure my self-perception against the collective responses.

2. Faculty and staff evaluation threat level is reduced because the Head has "led the way" and they have had their say.

3. Who knows, better than the faculty, the rating on such questions as "Gives intellectual leadership," "Knows what is going on in my class," "Is open to faculty/staff suggestions"?

C. Comments

1. I fear that Board evaluation without faculty participation tends to fix on financial matters and P.R. skills. We all know that these are not the heart of the matter.

2. I am not yet happy with the form of our evaluation questions. I feel that more open-ended questions would produce more useful information. For instance, three or four years ago I learned that I tend to sit at "the head" of the faculty lunch table and that that "bugged" some junior members of the faculty. I have been "below the salt" ever since. Minor, but important in a school!

3. The Head, I firmly believe, is teacher, counselor, and leader of the faculty. If they are not "in" on the evaluation, an important aspect of the evaluatory information is missing.

4. We have not yet reached the point of Board evaluation, but I think we are moving in this direction--to good results, I am sure.

School Head

## Head Evaluation Form

Rating scale (circle one): 1--strongly agree; 2--agree; 3--neutral; 4--disagree; 5--strongly disagree; 6--no opinion

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | The Head plays favorites with some teachers. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 2. | Teachers usually know where they stand with the Head. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 3. | The Head is generally aware of staff problems. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 4. | My opinion on important school matters is seldom sought by the Head. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 5. | The Head is unable objectively to evaluate teaching styles different from his own. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 6. | The Head usually considers staff feelings when making program decisions affecting staff. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 7. | The Head is not direct in dealing with staff members. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 8. | Teachers have little input to school staffing decisions. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 9. | The Head actively promotes high staff morale. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 10. | The Head is willing to "counsel" a staff member when the staff member's performance suggests that such action be taken. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 11. | The Head is actively involved in seeing that good teaching takes place at this school. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 12. | The Head implements important changes in the school without consulting the faculty. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 13. | The Head is capable of evaluating my success as a teacher. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 14. | The Head openly recognizes successful performance of staff members. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 15. | The Head does not effectively communicate school policy to staff. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 16. | The Head supports staff members in dealings with parents. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 17. | I don't feel at ease when talking with the Head. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 18. | The Head encourages teacher independence. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 19. | The Head recognizes the contributions of individual teachers. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 20. | Students respect the Head. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 21. | The Head has good contact with students. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 22. | The Head deals fairly with student problems. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 23. | The Head does little to create a comfortable atmosphere for students. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 24. | The Head deals effectively with student discipline problems. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 25. | The Head effectively communicates school policy to students. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 26. | I am generally satisfied with the job the Head is doing. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 27. | The school is run efficiently. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 28. | Communication is good between Head and staff. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 29. | The Head retains composure under pressure. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 30. | I usually trust the judgment of the Head. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 31. | The Head is able to react well in crisis situations. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 32. | The Head seldom assumes a leadership role in curriculum and program development. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 33. | The Head actively works to improve racial relations at school. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 34. | The Head has not improved communication at school. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 35. | Rate the present state of staff morale at school. | low average high |

Discuss any strengths or weaknesses of the Head which you feel are important:

In your opinion, what single change in the actions of the Head would make your feelings as a staff member more positive?

Make any comments about the Head which you feel are germane to this evaluation:

(Adapted from the December 1974 Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals.)

## APPENDIX H

This school sets forth objectives and then a year later identifies both areas of strength and areas of concern as the basis for its evaluation of the Head's performance. No forms are used.

1. During the summer I prepare a background statement for the Board which outlines specific administrative objectives for the coming year. In this I try to convey how I plan to use my time on special efforts beyond the usual daily or annual functions that go along with the basic job.

2. This list of objectives is reviewed with the Board Chairman in August before school begins. Generally there is little modification at this time, but there is an opportunity for modification if appropriate.

3. At the first Board meeting of the year (generally the first week in October), I present my formal annual report for the previous year, answer questions, and then go over the specific administrative objectives for the forthcoming year. The Trustees receive a written copy of the annual report and a memo listing the objectives in advance of the meeting.

4. While some aspects of my annual plan will obviously be discussed in one way or another at other Board meetings, the actual evaluation of my performance takes place during the next summer following the close of the academic year. I prepare for the Chairman of the Board my own summary of how well I feel the objectives for the year have been met, identifying areas that still require further attention, and formally requesting a review by the Board.

5. The Chairman of the Board then sends a memorandum to each member of the Board of Trustees soliciting their reactions to my performance and suggestions for the future.

6. After a reasonable interval, the Chairman of the Board meets with one or more members of the Executive Committee to review feedback and other information provided by the Trustees.

7. Finally, in late July or early August, the Board Chairman and I meet and he shares with me his and the Board's evaluation of my performance, specifically indicating both areas of strength and areas of concern. He also asks me for my reaction as well as to give him an informal evaluation of the performance of the Board and to mention any concerns that I may have about the Board and its activity. This is the end of the annual cycle and the process repeats itself with my statement of my objectives for the next year, Board review of these, etc.

We do not use any specific forms or checklists and generally we like the open-ended format, which makes it easier, I believe, for us to be sure that we've concentrated on the important items.

School Head

## APPENDIX I

**This particular method of formal evaluation of the Head and administrative team was followed for the first time in 1977-78.**

By mid-October the first line administrators give to the Head their goals for the following calendar year. The Head pulls all these together and summarizes them in a letter for the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. At a regular Executive Committee meeting, in late October, the Executive Committee and the Head go over the goals for the coming year and make any adjustments they feel helpful. The Head then goes back and works with the administrative team until both the administrators and the Executive Committee of the Board agree on the goals for the following year. In late November or early December the Executive Committee and the Administrative team meet together to talk over the final goals and to come to an understanding about them.

The formal evaluation of the Head takes place in late November or early December. It is done by a subcommittee of the Executive Committee of the Board, and always includes the Chairman of the Board. The Committee consists of three or four people. The evaluation begins with a meeting of the first line administrators, Head, and evaluating committee. The goals as chosen the previous year are used as the basis for evaluation, and each administrator reports on his or her area of responsibility. The Head then meets alone with the evaluating committee and together they assess the overall progress in the school, the role of the Head, and the role of each of the first line administrators. This is a formal evaluation and takes place once a year. You will note that the setting of the goals for the coming year and the evaluation of the goals of the past year take place at the same time--though as separate items of agenda at the meeting.

The period used for the evaluation of the Head is the calendar year, not the fiscal year, which is July 1-June 30. This is an advantage, since much of the planning for the coming school year starts as early as January of the current year. No decision has been made as to whether this evaluation process will be followed up by a formal letter of appraisal from the Executive Committee to the Head.

School Head

## APPENDIX J

## Association of Governing Boards

## Self-Study Criteria

### Criterion 1. Institutional Mission and Educational Policy

No institution can be all things to all people. Each institution must decide what its particular mission is--its real purpose--if it is to have sound direction. The mission must be clearly defined so students will know the institution's purposes and objectives, faculty members will know how to direct their efforts, and the several publics on whom the campus community depends will know what they are supporting.

An official statement setting forth the specific mission of a college or university should be a cooperative effort of the administration, the faculty, and the governing board. Acting alone, the board lacks the professional experience to define educational goals in detail. Its role is to insure that the mission is clearly stated; and because it stands apart from day-to-day operations, administrative preoccupations, and faculty special interests, the board is in a unique position to lead, seek consensus, and stimulate action.

---

The Trustee Committee and School Administration Committee of NAIS are greatly indebted to the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges for the special permission they have extended to us to reproduce their Self-Study Criteria for Governing Boards of Private Colleges and Universities. It is a major contribution to this publication. Governance in higher education is not strictly the same as in elementary and secondary schools, but there are so many similarities, so many principles which apply across the board despite differences in scale, that we feel all school Trustees and administrators will be ahead in their own thinking after reviewing the results of this extensive project in board self-evaluation, which was completed as recently as 1976. Support for development of these materials by the Association of Governing Boards was provided by the Ford Foundation. Readers have been granted permission to photocopy material in this appendix. The Association of Governing Boards has further offered readers special member rates, should they wish to order the original document, entitled Self-Study Guidelines and Criteria for Governing Boards of Private Colleges and Universities--$4.00 per copy; 10 or more copies, $3.00 each--from Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Is there a written and officially adopted statement of the institution's mission or purpose? | _____ | _____ |
| 2. In your opinion is this statement sufficiently clear to serve as a guide to academic planning, decision-making, and student recruitment? | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Do you feel that the institution lives up to its stated mission? | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Does the board periodically review its statement of purpose and educational goals, and examine the policies which implement them? | _____ | _____ |
| 5. Does the board assume a role in helping to determine basic educational policies? | _____ | _____ |

Summary: In relation to this criterion I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good _____ Good _____ Barely Adequate _____ Poor _____

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

## Criterion 2. Institutional Planning

In the difficult period stretching ahead for higher education, effective planning is increasingly essential. The number and future sources of students should be anticipated. Projections of expenses and income need to be studied. The character of the educational program and student services must be considered. The size of the faculty and its distribution by rank and tenured status are matters to be carefully plotted.

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Does the board require, participate in, review, and approve comprehensive institutional planning regarding: | | |
| a. enrollments? | _____ | _____ |

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| b. staffing? | ____ | ____ |
| c. physical facilities? | ____ | ____ |
| d. availability of resources? | ____ | ____ |
| e. educational programs? | ____ | ____ |
| 2. Was the faculty involved in the plan's development? | ____ | ____ |
| 3. Is there a schedule for reviewing and, if desirable, revising the plan at regular intervals? | ____ | ____ |

Summary: In relation to this criterion I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good _____ Good _____ Barely Adequate _____ Poor _____

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

Criterion 3. Physical Plant

It is the board's responsibility to create and maintain a physical environment that is conducive to learning and consistent with reasonable expectations of future funds and enrollment trends. Decisions that involve the campus master plan and the capital outlay budget request are the major concerns. Prudence demands that maximum use be made of the present physical plant before construction or remodeling is considered. Efficient use of the board's time and effort requires that it be concerned only with those matters that cannot properly be delegated to the staff.

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Has the board approved a master plan for the physical campus which includes both present and anticipated needs? | ____ | ____ |

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 2. Do you feel that the board makes decisions on details related to buildings and grounds that really should be delegated to the administrative staff? | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Within the past two years, has the board received and reviewed a report on physical plant utilization --classroom, laboratory, office and other building space? | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Prior to its consideration of requests for remodeling or new construction has the board satisfied itself that present spaces are being used effectively and instructional areas are scheduled for optimum utilization? | _____ | _____ |

Summary: In relation to this criterion I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good _____ Good _____ Barely Adequate _____ Poor _____

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

Criterion 4. Financial Support and Management

In the financial affairs of the institution the board has a dual responsibility. It must secure the financial resources sufficient to meet operating costs and maintain the institution in a manner consistent with its stated mission and goals. It must be sure that the institution has prudent fiscal management. The collective effort of all board members is essential to the first responsibility. The second responsibility calls upon the expertise of those board members who are experienced in devising financial policies, managing investments, or have other financial skills. The board must see to it that sound financial policies are followed, yet refrain from personal involvement in execution of policies and administration of financial programs.

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Do you feel that the resource development program is well organized into a continuing and coordinated effort of the board and the president? | ____ | ____ |
| 2. Do you feel there is an adequate financial commitment on the part of the individual members to: | | |
| a. personal giving? | ____ | ____ |
| b. influencing other persons or organizations to give? | ____ | ____ |
| 3. Does the board have within its membership persons with special expertise who give their advice and leadership in the following areas: | | |
| a. long-range fiscal planning? | ____ | ____ |
| b. investment practices? | ____ | ____ |
| c. fiscal management? | ____ | ____ |
| d. budget review? | ____ | ____ |
| e. analyses of reports and recommendations of the auditor? | ____ | ____ |
| 4. Do you feel that the board fully accepts its responsibility for prudent fiscal management? | ____ | ____ |

Summary: In relation to this criterion I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good _____ Good _____ Barely Adequate _____ Poor _____

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

Criterion 5. Board Membership

A primary requisite for effective governance is to be sure that the men and women responsible for the institution's policy direction have the skills, knowledge, and background necessary for effective decision-making. The complex operation of modern educational institutions requires that boards have available to them a wide range of experiences and expertise. The larger society to which these institutions are now linked more closely than ever before requires that the board's membership be more diverse in terms of geographic, social or occupational origins, and viewpoints. Such diversity does not require that members be representatives of special groups or interests unless this is specified in the bylaws or charter. Each member must be willing to serve the interests of the institution as a whole.

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Do you feel that the board now contains a sufficient range of expertise, attitudes, and external relationships to make it an effective board? | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Does the board have a committee which assesses the board's needs in the way of qualifications of new members, and which maintains a roster of prospective members? | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Does the board have an established procedure for orienting new members to their duties and responsibilities? | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Do you feel that the board should alter its policies and practices with respect to: | | |
| a. length of term? | _____ | _____ |
| b. number of successive terms? | _____ | _____ |
| c. age limit or honorary retirement? | _____ | _____ |
| d. age composition? | _____ | _____ |
| e. sex composition? | _____ | _____ |
| f. minority composition? | _____ | _____ |
| g. persons with educational experience? | _____ | _____ |
| h. persons with financial management experience? | _____ | _____ |

Summary: In relation to this criterion I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good _____ Good _____ Barely Adequate _____ Poor _____

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

Criterion 6. Board Organization

The effectiveness of a board greatly depends on the structure of its organization and the conduct of its meetings. A productive board is usually one that has periodically taken the time to thoughtfully sort out its duties, critically review its organizational structure and rules of procedure, and update its bylaws, policy or operations documents. Committee structure depends upon the board's size, the frequency of meetings, and the workload that can be placed on individual members. Periodic critical review should also determine, among other things, if a few persons are in fact making most of the board's decisions, if responsible minority opinions have the opportunity for full board consideration, and if communications channels between the campus community and the public are being kept open.

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Within the past two or three years, has the board in some formal way reviewed its organization, committee practices, and bylaws? | ____ | ____ |
| 2. With respect to the board's agenda: | | |
| a. does it put before you issues of policy the board should consider? | ____ | ____ |
| b. is it accompanied by appropriate supporting information in the right amount? | ____ | ____ |
| c. does it reach you sufficently in advance of the meeting? | ____ | ____ |
| 3. Do you believe that the number and duration of board meetings are sufficient to properly take care of the institution's business? | ____ | ____ |
| 4. Do you feel that the present committee structure: | | |
| a. makes for efficient handling of the board's work? | ____ | ____ |

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| b. gives the full board the opportunity to consider all matters of key importance to the institution? | ____ | ____ |
| c. allows constituencies to be heard before recommendations are formed? | ____ | ____ |
| 5. Do board policies governing selection of board and committee offices afford sufficient opportunity for rotating leadership? | ____ | ____ |

Summary: In relation to this criterion I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good _____ Good _____ Barely Adequate _____ Poor _____

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

Criterion 7. Board/Chief Executive Relations

Trustees and the chief executive officer share at least one major characteristic: they have a total institutional perspective. The quality of the "working relationship" between the board and the executive officer is of critical importance to the effectiveness of each. While the board must take responsibility for basic policies and their consequences it must also give the chief executive the authority and flexibility to act decisively.

Selection of the chief executive officer is a major responsibility of the governing board. This selection should be preceded by a clear definition of his or her qualifications and expected accomplishments.

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Is there a climate of mutual trust and support between the board and the chief executive? | ____ | ____ |
| 2. Have the board or some of its members counseled with the chief executive to provide guidelines or strengthen certain areas of performance? | ____ | ____ |

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 3. Do you feel that the board has delegated to the chief executive the authority he or she needs to administer the institution successfully? | ____ | ____ |
| 4. Is there a clear understanding of the executive's responsibility and role in fund raising; is it coordinated with the similar responsibility and role of the board? | | |
| 5. If you were a trustee when the incumbent chief was selected: | | |
| a. were the selection procedures carefully planned and documented? | ____ | ____ |
| b. was there a prepared statement of specific duties, responsibilities, expectations? | ____ | ____ |
| c. were such constituencies as the faculty, administrators, students, alumni/ae consulted? | ____ | ____ |
| d. was there a specific list of perquisites (retirement plan, house, auto, etc.) in the terms of appointment? | ____ | ____ |

Summary: In relation to this criterion I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good _____ Good _____ Barely Adequate _____ Poor _____

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

Criterion 8. Board/Faculty Relations

In academic affairs a measure of the board's success is the nature of its relationship with the faculty. Most lay board members lack the professional expertise to legislate in this area, yet they share the burden of responsi-

bility for the quality of the institution and for the manner in which the institution fulfills its academic goals. Therefore, the board must trust the professionals for advice, and delegate to them authority to carry out educational policies and procedures.

The line between governing policy and operating policy is not easily drawn but it must be established with reasonable clarity. The institution needs to be given academic direction, yet the faculty must be free to perform its professional work.

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Does the board have effective means of two-way communication with the faculty? | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Does the board, through the chief executive, seek the advice and recommendations of faculty leaders in formulating basic educational policies? | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Do you feel that the board exercises authority over: | | |
| a. _____ more aspects of educational affairs than it needs to? | | |
| b. _____ fewer aspects of educational affairs than it should? | | |
| c. _____ neither. Its participation in educational affairs is about right. | | |
| 4. Does the board delegate to the chief executive and faculty full responsibility for implementing educational policies? | _____ | _____ |
| 5. Has the board adopted adequate policies concerning: | | |
| a. grievance procedures? | _____ | _____ |
| b. processes for selection, promotion, retention, tenure? | _____ | _____ |
| c. standards for faculty performance? | _____ | _____ |

Summary: In relation to this criterion I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good _____ Good _____ Barely Adequate _____ Poor _____

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

Criterion 9. Board/Student Relations

The board has ultimate responsibility to protect the welfare of students and to provide a healthy campus environment that is conducive to scholarship and personal development. The students' health and comfort are essential to learning. The students' freedom to learn independently is a basic tenet of academic freedom, and like other freedoms it must be exercised under the obligation to protect the welfare of the community as a whole. The board should have good lines of communication to and from students.

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Does the board have a satisfactory means for continuing two-way communication with students? | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Has the board approved policies that make adequate provision for the students' health, welfare, and non-curricular (cultural, educational, recreational) activities? | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Has the board set adequate policies for student appeal of perceived injustices (academic or other)? | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Are students and student organizations free to examine and discuss questions or issues of interest to them and to express opinions publicly, so long as it is made clear that they speak only for themselves? | _____ | _____ |

Summary: In relation to this criterion I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good _____ Good _____ Barely Adequate _____ Poor _____

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

Criterion 10. Court of Appeal

Governing boards may be called upon to fulfill a quasi-judicial function in the settlement of disputes arising within the institutional community,

though generally disputes should be settled at the lowest possible administrative level to avoid inappropriate board involvement in operational matters. The board should carefully develop due process policies and delegate authority.

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Has the board developed procedural due process or "fair hearing" requirements which delegate the management of conflict situations to the chief executive and to academic administrators or faculty leaders? | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Are the disputes that have been brought to the board: | | |
| a. accurately and concisely briefed for your study? | _____ | _____ |
| b. brought to the board before they have escalated to crisis proportions? | _____ | _____ |
| c. settled without unduly prolonged debate? | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Do you feel that disputes have been settled with sympathetic understanding of the human and institutional issues involved? | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Do you feel that the board has been called upon to adjudicate cases of conflict that should have been settled before they came to the board? | _____ | _____ |

Summary: In relation to this criterion I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good _____ Good _____ Barely Adequate _____ Poor _____

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion: